

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Functions and Awards Committee

Campus Governance

2-26-2016

Functions and Awards minutes 02/26/2016

Functions and Awards

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/fawards>

Recommended Citation

Functions and Awards, "Functions and Awards minutes 02/26/2016" (2016). *Functions and Awards Committee*. 2.
<http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/fawards/2>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Functions and Awards Committee by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

Functions and Awards committee minutes from February 26, 2016

Present: Elena, Karen, Tom, Sam, Janell, Peter, Alicia, and Michael (minutes)

Minutes from the last meeting approved.

We briefly discussed the timeline of the nomination process for commencement speaker. We narrowed the window to Monday March 23 through Monday March 28, which was approved.

We then turned to the Scholar of the College nominations

Our process was to vote on-line to determine whether a student should receive Scholar of the College or not. For all the students who has only yes votes, we voted to approve them. Then we turned to cases that were questionable.

For one student's case, we asked: Can we give someone the SOC for multiple years? We concluded that, if it's the same presentation, then the student can't get the award twice. We had a specific question about this student's presentation at the historical society. Did the presentation undergo a review process by experts? We need to ask sponsor for clarification to see if it meets the criteria.

Another case—should a student get the award even if she doesn't present the paper at the conference? Tom makes the point that if she didn't complete the paper and go beyond what was initially written in the class, then it should not get the award. Vote to decide if she should get the award: all agree not to approve this case for the award.

Another case: there is a question about SURF about whether it would qualify a student for the award. Elena notes that it is part of a research fellowship. The student had to do a poster session, like the rest of the fellows. Therefore, it is possible that it doesn't go through a review process. Also, it is possible that every fellow gets his or her poster accepted. We need clarification from sponsor.

Another case, this time about a theater performance: Peter clarified how outside evaluators assessed the quality of a performance when they come to UMM in order to determine if a performance could move to the next level. Therefore, there were external experts who reviewed this work. We voted to accept.

As a group, we voted to get more information for four applications.

We briefly discussed whether F&A should select the committee for the Distinguished Faculty Research Award, and we concluded that F&A would not be the best group to form that committee. Elena will talk with Bart, division chairs, and previous recipients to determine the best way to form the committee.